(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
8.	Haryana	36	12	12
9.	Himachal Pradesh	9	2	
10.	Jammu and Kashmir	12	12	9
11.	Jharkhand	89	89	89
12.	Karnataka	93	36	35
13.	Kerala	37	27	27
14.	Madhya Pradesh	85	85	43
15.	Maharashtra	187	131	103
16.	Manipur	3	2	2
17.	Meghalaya	3	3	3
18.	Mizoram	3	3	3
19.	Nagaland	3	2	2
20.	Orissa	72	72	31
21.	Punjab	29	16	16
22.	Rajasthan	83	83	83
23.	Sikkim	3	2	
24.	Tamil Nadu	49	49	49
25.	Tripura	3	3	3
26.	Uttaranchal	45	45	41
27.	Uttar Pradesh	242	242	242
28.	West Bengal	152	59	55
	TOTAL	1734	1401	1136

Vacant posts of Judges

608. SHRI RAMACHANDRA KHUNTIA :

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ CHAVAN :

Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) the vacant posts of judges as on date, in Supreme Court, all High Courts, District Judge Courts and other courts in the country, State-wise;

(b) whether it is a fact that a large number of cases are pending in the courts because of a number of vacancies and also more holidays in judiciary;

(c) whether it is a fact that the Fast Track Courts created by Government also could not achieve the goal; and

(d) whether Government have any action plan to develop the infrastructure to dispose of cases at least in one year ?

THE MINISTRY OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI P. C. THOMAS): (a) There are three vacancies of judges in the Supreme Court as on 1-12-2003. As regards vacancies in High Courts and Subordinate Courts, statements are enclosed as Statements I and II respectively (*See* below).

(b) The non-filling of vacancies of judges, inadequate judges-strength, more holidays and frequest adjournment of cases are some of the major reasons for pendency of cases in different courts.

(c) As per available information with this Department, as on 30-11-2003, 1401 Fast Track Courts have been notified by the States out of which 1136 Fast Track Courts are functional. These Courts have disposed off 2,77,120 cases out of 5,72,777 cases transferred to them.

(d) Disposal off cases relates to the substantive function of judiciary. It is the primary responsibility of the State Government to develop infrastructure facilities for the High Courts and Subordinate Courts. However, the Central Government has also taken up a number of measures which, *inter alia*, include provision of funds under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for development of infrastructure facilities for the judiciary, Computerisation of City Courts in Metropolitan cities of Delhi, Mumbai, Chennai and Calcutta, creation of Fast Track Courts, provision of funds for establishment of facilitation center in the courts, etc.

Statement I

Vacancies of Judges in Various High Courts

Sl. No.	Name of the High Court	Present Approved Strength	Vacancies as on 1-12-2003
1.	Allahabad	95	29
2.	Andhra Pradesh	39	07
3.	Bombay	60	06
4.	Calcutta	50	09
5.	Chhattisgarh	06	03
6.	Delhi	33	08
7.	Gauhati	19	07
8.	Gujarat	42	12
9.	Himachal Pradesh	08	02
10.	Jammu and Kashmir	14	06
11.	Jharkhand	12	01
12.	Karnataka	40	04
13.	Kerala	29	04
14.	Madhya Pradesh	29	03
15.	Madras	42	07
16.	Orissa	16	04
17.	Patna	31	08
18.	Punjab and Haryana	40	14
19.	Rajasthan	40	19
20.	Sikkim	03	01
21.	Uttaranchal	07	02
	TOTAL	655	156

Statement-II

Status of the Vacant Posts of Judicial Officers
(Updated on 03-12-2003)

Sl. No.	Name of the State/UT	No. of sanctioned posts of Judicial Officers	No. of posts filled	No. of vacant posts	Information as on
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Andhra Pradesh	682	601	81	May 03
2	Assam*	259	205	54	Jun 01
3	Arunachal Pradesh*	293	293	0	Dec 98
4	Bihar	1137	929	208	Jun 02
5	Jharkhand	551	537	14	Jan 03
6	Gujarat	655	586	69	Apr 03
7	Goa	44	36	8	Apr 03
8	Haryana	283	210	73	Oct 03
9	Himachal Pradesh	98	92	6	Jan 03
10	Jammu and Kashmir	197	194	3	Jun 02
11	Karnataka	677	589	58	July 03
12	Kerala	380	370	10	Jun 02
13	Madhya Pradesh	792	660	132	Dec 02
14	Chhattisgarh	189	163	26	Jun 02
15	Maharashtra	1095	994	101	Jun 02
16	Manipur	32	28	4	Jun 01
17	Meghalaya	8	7	1	Jun 02
18	Mizoram	34	18	16	Jun 02
19	Nagaland	21	18	3	Jun 02
20	Orissa	483	385	98	Jun 02
21	Punjab	303	273	83	Jun 03
22	Rajasthan	792	686	106	Jun 02
23	Sikkim	10	10	0	Mar 03
24	Tamil Nadu	767	702	65	Jan 03
25	Tripura	75	60	15	May 03
26	Uttar Pradesh	2136	1592	544	May 03
27	Uttaranchal	186	59	127	Jun 03
28	West Bengal	588	470	118	Apr 03
29	A & N Islands	8	8	0	July 03
30	Chandigarh	19	19	0	Nov 02
31	Delhi	385	313	72	April 03
32	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	2	2	0	Jun 02

1	2	3	4	5	6
33	Daman and Diu	1	1	0	Jun 02
34	Lakshadweep	3	3	0	Apr 03
35	Pondicherry	19	13	6	Jan 03
	TOTAL	13,204	11,103	2101	

*Judiciary is not completely separated from executive.

Uniform Civil Code

609. SHRI RAJKUMAR DHOOT: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the need for uniform civil code has gained momentum during the past some time; and

(b) if so, the steps being taken in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI P. C. THOMAS): (a) and (b) The Hon'ble Supreme Court in its judgement dated the 21st July, 2003 in the matter of John Vallamattom Vs. Union of India had *inter alia* observed on the desirability of enacting a Uniform Civil Code. However, at present, there is no specific proposal for undertaking a legislation in this regard.

Evaluation of Maritime Security Measures

610. SHRI R.S. GAVAI ; Will the Minister of SHIPPING be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have re-evaluated maritime security measures keeping in view the warning by the International Maritime Organisation in the wake of rising terrorist threats;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) the measures adopted for inspection of cargo before and after shipment; and

(d) whether these measures are delaying shipment of cargo?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SHIPPING (SHRI DILIP KUMAR MANSUKHLAL GANDHI): (a) and (b) Yes, Sir. Following the tragic events of 11th September, 2001, the Internationl Maritime Organization adopted new provisions in the International